



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/895,891	06/29/2001	Michael Joseph Calderaro	AUS9-2001-0237-US1	7073
7590	05/06/2004		EXAMINER	
Joseph T. Van Leeuwen P.O. Box 81641 Austin, TX 78708-1641			LU, KUEN S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2177	7
DATE MAILED: 05/06/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/895,891	CALDERARO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Kuen S Lu	2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3/11/2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/6-29-2001</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Supplement to non-Final Office Action

1. Applicants' Amendment filed on 3/11/2004 is noted and considered. The Amendment is addressed in the Sections of "**DETAILED ACTION**" and "**Response to Arguments**" as below.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

1. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cafolla et al. (Oracle Human Resources, North American User's Guide, Release 11, Volume 1, March 1998, hereafter "Cafolla") and in view of Bapat et al. (U.S. Patent 6,236,996, hereafter "Bapat").

As per independent claims 1, 8 and 14, Cafolla teaches the "the first view including employee profile information corresponding to a plurality of employees" at Page 13-2, lines 8-10 by using people folder as the first view to find people of interest.

Cafolla does not specifically teach excluding rows from a first view to directly create a second view, though Cafolla teaches creating a new window from an existing first view, for example at Page 8-24 by displaying a payroll batch window and selecting the **Defaults** to display a second window at Page 8-25.

However, Cafolla teaches entering additional query criteria to create new view as desired at Pages 7-45 and 7-46.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine the teaching of creating new window from existing window, and creating new view based on additional query criteria from the Cafolla reference by using the new query criteria to exclude records as selected from a first view to generate a second view because an ordinary skilled in the art who could create views would have known that view can be used to hide or include some rows from user(s) through the implementation of a **where** clause in a SQL statement. Furthermore, creating a narrower view from a broader view is a common daily routine to ordinary skilled in the art, for example, hiding some icons on PC monitor, opening portion of file directories and narrowing down context searches of documents. This practices all have something in common: excluding some records from a first view to result in a narrower next view.

Cafolla does not specifically teach "granting view access to the second view to one or more of the selected employees", though Cafolla teaches granting permission to roles process at Page 34-15, Paragraph "ROLEGEN".

However, Bapat teaches granting query on a view to user(s) at col. 22, lines 1-22.

Art Unit: 2177

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine the teachings of Caffola and Bapat by granting **select** permission of view to user(s) as desired because the execution of creating and granting view in two subsequent steps is a well know practice to one ordinary skilled in the art.

As per claims 2, 9 and 15, Cafolla further teaches "displaying the employee profile information in the second view on one or more display devices" and "wherein at least one of the display devices corresponds to one of the selected employees" at Page 13-2, lines 8-10 by using people folder as the first view to find people of interest and then using inquiry window as the second view to show specific information about a person (Page 13-2, lines 11-12) who him/herself is running the HRMS application;

As per claims 3, 10 and 16, Cafolla further teaches "simultaneously displaying employee profile information pertaining to the second view to a plurality of collaborating employees, wherein the collaborating employees include at least one of the selected employees" at Page 14-36 by showing the assignment history window, as the first view, for all of an employee's assignments while the assignment folder window being utilized as the first view (Page 30-3, lines 14-16);

"receiving an employee profile change request to revise the employee profile data corresponding to one of the employees, the received request being from one of the collaborating employees" at Page 14-4 (last paragraph) and Page 14-9;

"modifying the employee profile data according to the request" at Page 14-4 (last paragraph) ; and

Art Unit: 2177

“displaying the modified employee profile data to the plurality of collaborating employees” at at Page 14-36 by showing the assignment history window, as the first view, for all of an employee’s assignments while the assignment folder window being utilized as the first view (Page 30-3, lines 14-16).

As per Claims 4, 11 and 17, Cafolla further teaches “the first view corresponds to a manager and wherein each of the excluded employee profiles corresponds to an employee that reports to the manager” at Pages A-31 by navigating the “Organization” menu for reaching an organization in the hierarchy, and Page 2-38, Paragraph “To create a new version of an existing hierarchy” by having subordinates block modified for including the employees with profiles excluded corresponding to the employee reports to the organization manager.

As per Claims 5, 12 and 18, Cafolla further teaches “storing second view data corresponding to the second view on a nonvolatile storage area, the second view data including a grant list of employees that were granted access to the second view and an exclusion list of employee profiles that were excluded from the second view” at Page 34-2 by controlling user’s access through records and organization information types and, then storing the information by using Oracle Application Data Export to export and save the data in the view to storage (Page 30-2).

As per claims 6, 13 and 19, Cafolla further teaches “receiving a view request from a requesting employee” at Page 14-28 by listing people by assignment; “retrieving the second view data” at Page 14-36 by listing an assignment history of person(s) selected from the first view;

"comparing the requesting employee with the grant list of employees" at Page 34-2 by controlling user's access through records and organization information types; and "determining whether to allow the requesting employee access to the second view in response to the comparison" Page 14-29 by restricting a further review of the list.

As per claims 7 and 20, Cafolla further teaches "displaying a list of reporting employees to a manager" at Page 14-29 by displaying the assignment list; and "wherein the selecting includes receiving one or more exclusion selections from the manager in response to the displayed list" at Page 14-29, lines 11-12 (excluding counting lines in the table) by further restricting the list of the employees to be displayed.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusions

3. The prior art made of record

U. Oracle Human Resources, North American User's Guide, Release 11, Volume 1, March 1998.

A. U.S. Patent 6,236,996

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

B. U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0184148

C. U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0182178

Art Unit: 2177

D. U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0216957A1

E. U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0154098

F. U.S. Patent 6,460,036

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kuen S Lu whose telephone number is 703-305-4894.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 5 PM, Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on 703-305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Kuen S. Lu

Patent Examiner

April 26, 2004

John E. Breene
JOHN BREENE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100